

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/635,847	KONISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nelson D. Hernandez.

(3) Dennis Chan.

(2) Lin Ye.

(4) Chad Billing.

Date of Interview: 08 August 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and independent claims having amendments similar to claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ishihara et al. (US 6,091,513) and Kawamura (US 5,821,997).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 LIN YE
 SPE. ART UNIT 2622

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant representative discussed the proposed amendments made to overcome the rejections made in the previous Office Action. The Examiner acknowledged that the proposed amendment as written would overcome the previous rejections, however, the Examiner suggested to clarify the functions of the plurality of processors individually since the claims using the phrase "including at least one selected from a group consisting of" can be overcome by citing a singular reference teaching a processor performing at least one of the processes included in the claims. Also the Examiner suggested to clarify the claimed image signal as an entire image since the claims as written can be read on a reference teaching dividing or separating the image into different color signals and processing the signals separately using individual processors for each signal. The Applicants representatives indicated that would take in consideration the Examiner's suggestions to amend the claims to further clarify the differences between the invention and the prior art.